R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 277 UD 002 472

THE AFTER-SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS - REMEDIAL AND TUTORIAL - FOR PUBLIC AND NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PUPILS.

BY- BERNSTEIN, BRUCE H.
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION, NEW YORK, N.Y.

PUB DATE 31 AUG 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.56 39P.

DESCRIPTORS- *AFTER SCHOOL CENTERS, *ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS, *TUTORING, *EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED, PUBLIC SCHOOLS, *EVALUATION, PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS, COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, NEW YORK CITY, ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS

AN EVALUATION WAS MADE OF AFTER-SCHOOL REMEDIAL CENTERS FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS. THE CENTERS WERE STAFFED BY PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOL PERSONNEL. DATA ON THE PUBLIC AND NONPUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENTS RECEIVING THE TUTORING WERE COLLECTED THROUGH INTERVIEWS AND OBSERVER REPORTS. THE INVESTIGATOR FOUND THAT THE CENTERS WERE INITIALLY SUCCESSFUL IN ESTABLISHING A FRIENDLY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN A PARTICIPATING NONPUBLIC SCHOOL AND A NEARBY PUBLIC SCHOOL, ALTHOUGH SOME ANIMOSITY DEVELOPED LATER BECAUSE OF SCHEDULING PROBLEMS. THE NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS HAD DIFFICULTY IN INTERESTING PARENTS AND STUDENTS AND IN SELECTING PUPILS TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PROGRAM. THE PUBLIC SCHOOL PERSONNEL FACED SEVERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS AS A RESULT OF HASTY PROGRAM PLANNING, RECOMMENDATIONS INDICATED A NEED FOR (1) A DISCUSSION OF THE MOST ADVANTAGEOUS TIME AND PLACE FOR THE PROGRAM, (2) PUBLIC INFORMATION AND PARENT SUPPORT, AND (3) ATTENTION TO THE PROBLEM OF PUBLIC AND NONPUBLIC STUDENT MINGLING. THE FUNCTIONS OF THE PROGRAM ARE SPECIFICALLY DESCRIBED, AND FURTHER SUGGESTIONS FOR ITS IMPROVEMENT ARE MADE. (NC)

ED011277

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street, New York

Educational Practices Division
Nathan Brown, Associate Director

Evaluation of New York City School District educational projects funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) - performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1965-66 School Year.

Joseph Krevisky
Research Coordinator, Title I Projects

THE AFTER-SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS - REMEDIAL AND TUTORIAL - FOR PUBLIC AND NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PUPILS

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

37p.

UD002472

UD 002 472

Bruce H. Bernstein
Research Director

August 31, 1966

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street, New York

Educational Practices Division
Nathan Brown, Associate Director

Evaluation of New York City School District educational projects funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) - performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1965-66 School Year.

Joseph Krevisky
Research Coordinator, Title I Projects

THE AFTER-SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS - REMEDIAL AND TUTORIAL - FOR PUBLIC AND NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PUPILS

Bruce H. Bernstein
Research Director

August 31, 1966

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION Nature of Project	1
II.	THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROGRAM Salary Schedules Selection of Pupils Other Procedures Enrollment and Attendance	1 2 3 3 4
III.	DESCRIPTION AND METHODOLOGY	5
IV.	FINDINGS Selection Registration and Attendance Supervision and Organization Coordination Mingling Staff Class Visits Discussion and Recommendations	7 7 8 11 - 12 14 14 15 16 18
APPENDIX	DESCRIPTIVE DATA ON SCHOOLS IN PROGRAM THE EVALUATION STAFF NEW YORK TIMES ARTICLE, June 3, 1966	25 - 31 32 33

I. Nature of the Program

Educationally disadvantaged children come from backgrounds where the type of help and tutoring available to middle-class children is not available in the home. Often the favorable attitudes and achievement observed in a school are partially a reflection of the enriched environment of the home. In disadvantaged areas where an enriched home environment is generally lacking, provision must be made to provide this enrichment.

The New York City public school system, therefore, created an after-school remedial program to compensate as far as possible for the lack of opportunity created by social and economic conditions. This service had not been available to students attending non-public schools. The program brought the experience and personnel of the New York City school system to students with similar problems in private and parochial schools. The centers provided remedial and other services beyond the regular program and made available personnel, space, opportunity and incentive for pupil improvement. The plan called for a special instructional program tailored to the needs of the individual school. This involved remedial instruction as well as enrichment programs.

II. Development of the Program

The Non-Public After-School Study Center (ASSC) Program opened late in the 1965-66 academic year because of a series of delays influenced in large part by concern over the relationship between the parochial schools and the Board of Education. The Application for Federal Assistance was not signed by the Superintendent of Schools until March 21, 1966. The specific nature of these problems is beyond

the range of this report and these delays will be dealt with only as they directly impinged upon the functioning of the program.

The Centers opened on April 27, 1966. The public school administrators had been given three days notice in which to hire staff, set up the curriculum, coordinate with the non-public schools, etc. The plans for the approximately seven weeks that remained in the term called for a remedial program in reading and mathematics on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday of each week, from 3:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. In addition, speech therapy, music, art, and health education were provided in selected schools on designated days. Guidance Services were offered on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday evenings from 6:00 to 9:00 p.m. The scope of this study encompasses only the evaluation of the reading and mathematics portions of the program.

The exact allocation of subjects offered, and the number of sections needed, were determined by the Board of Education with non-public school representatives. Principals of ASSC schools were asked to recruit teachers from their own staffs or those of neighboring schools for reading and mathematics. It was expected that the same teacher would serve all three sessions per week with either reading or mathematics. It was indicated that in some cases it might be desirable to break each two hour session into two one-hour sessions with two groups meeting the teacher each day.

Salary Schedules

Per Two Hour Session:

Supervisor, in Charge of Center	$16.40
Teacher-Remedial Reading, Mathematics	12.95
Teacher-Speech Therapy	16.40

Teacher-Music	16.40
Teacher-Art Teacher	16.40
Teacher-Health Education	16.40
School Secretary	5.70
Per Three Hour Guidance Session:	
School Psychologist	$24.60
Guidance Counselor	24.60
School Social Worker	24.60
School Secretary, Guidance Center	12.90
Coordinator of Guidance Center	24.60
Stenographer	7.70

Selection of Pupils

The non-public school principal was to be responsible for the selection of pupils. Registration procedures and coordination of the program were to be determined at a meeting of the principals of the ASSC school and the non-public school. Frequent exchange of informal anecdotal data was also encouraged.

The registration and assignment of pupils to remedial classes was performed by the ASSC Supervisor. It was preferred that the supervisor be the assistant principal of the ASSC school. The non-public school principal was to be informed of the program assigned to each of the pupils.

Other Procedures

As indicated above, the ASSC Non-Public School Program began on Wednesday, April 27, 1966, and closed after the Friday, June 17, session. Sessions were not held on days when either the public school or the feeding non-public school were not in session. Because of the haste in setting up the program there were expected delays in receipt of materials and such forms as those needed for payroll, attendance, and other administrative aspects of the program. Supervisors were asked to

improvise and make the best use of whatever materials were at hand during those early stages of the program.

Enrollment and Attendance

This was an area that caused some controversy during the course of the program. The original directive of May 9, 1966 from Superintendent of Schools Bernard Donovan to the Principals of the ASSC schools announced that:

> If there is non-participation by the feeding non-public school by Tuesday, May 10, 1966, you are hereby authorized to close your center. To the extent possible, we will try to relocate your assigned teachers to other center locations. With the closing of your center, teachers should be removed from the payroll. Payment will be made for only those days served by the teachers.
>
> 15 children should be registered for each remedial group. <u>There should be an attendance of at least 10 for each session in these groups</u>. Where the attendance falls below this, the supervisor should communicate with the parochial school, draw on a waiting list, and make every effort to keep attendance at a high level. Where attendance consistently falls below 10, groups should be consolidated and the position returned to this Office. . . .

This was interpreted by some to mean that the program was to be limited to non-public school students (see New York Times article, Appendix). However, on the next page of Superintendent Donovan's directive it stated that:

> Although this program is designed to aid the disadvantaged children in non-public schools and to supplement the services of the public schools, no public school child should be turned away who comes from a public school within its attendance area and who has been directed to that center by that school.

The difficulty was presumably resolved by John B. King, Executive Deputy Superintendent of Schools, on May 20, in a supplement to and revision of the May 9, 1966 memorandum:

1. Selection and Placement of Pupils

All After-School Study Centers must be open to all children, public and non-public school pupils alike. Needs of children, rather than their schools of origin, should determine the organization of classes and groups. All classes and groups should, therefore, include both public and non-public school pupils.

2. Sessions of After-School Study Centers

Where necessary to do so, in order to include both public and non-public school children in classes or groups, principals are instructed to reschedule their present After-School Study Center sessions from 3:15 to 5:15 p.m. or at an earlier time to achieve this objective. Such a change will permit children from both public and non-public schools to attend during the same period of time and to participate in the same classes and activities and will avoid the separation of these children.

The Evaluation Program

Section 205 (a) (5) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (P.L. 89-10), Title I, states:

> "That effective procedures, including provision for appropriate objective measurements of educational achievement, will be adopted for evaluating at least annually the effectiveness of the programs in meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children."

In a resolution dated April 27, 1966, the Board of Education authorized the Center for Urban Education to evaluate programs in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. However, because of the delays in initiating the program, and the lateness in organizing the research, it was not possible to follow the outline as indicated in the original proposal (see Appendix).

Description and Methodology

During the fourth week in May, 1966, a team of four investigators (see Appendix) met to organize the evaluation. A random sample of 33 ASSC schools (see Appendix) was selected from the three boroughs of

New York City in which the greatest concentration of ASSC schools existed: Brooklyn, Manhattan, and the Bronx. One investigator covered Brooklyn, another the Bronx, and the two others divided the visitations in the Manhattan schools. In addition, 35 non-public schools which were the sending schools related to the 33 ASSC schools mentioned above, were visited. The size of the sample represents about 30% of the total population.

The evaluation methodology consisted mainly of interviews and observations, since the program was not in operation long enough to justify measurement of pupil change. Visits to the ASSC schools included interviews with the supervisors and teachers, and classroom observations. The objectives were to explore the following areas:

<u>With the Supervisors</u>

Procedures followed in organizing the ASSC

Rapport with non-public school

Coordination with the Board of Education

Supervision

Comments and Recommendations

<u>With the Teachers and in Class Observations</u>

General comments and recommendations

<u>With the Non-Public School Principal</u>

Procedures in selecting pupils

Rapport with public schools

Findings

Selection. Selection of the pupils was the responsibility of the non-public school principals. They employed a variety of strategies to initiate their schools entrance into the program. Some of the most enterprising called emergency meetings of the parents, others sent detailed letters home to explain what was happening. All seem to have required parental consent.

The majority of parents responded positively to the opportunity being offered. However, there was also significant negative response. Most numerous among the critical comments were:

> "Why should I pay money to send my child to private school and then have to send him to public school for remedial work?"
>
> "Why can't they offer these things in the non-public school?"
>
> "It's too long a school day for my child!"
>
> "It's too late to come home from school!"
>
> "I'm afraid of my child's being attacked by the public school children."

In almost all of the non-public schools, the teacher's recommendation was the prime criterion for selecting pupils. Teachers tended to choose students who were more than one year behind in reading, with the reading level most frequently determined by scores on the SRA Reading Test. Among the other standardized tests used for selection were the Otis, New York State Arithmetic Test, and the Catholic Messenger Reading Test. Enrollment in the non-public school was in all cases deemed sufficient proof of the student's eligibility for the ASSC Program, and no further evidence of "educational deprivation" was necessary.

The amount of freedom given to the non-public school children deemed most in need of help varied with the home school. Some put no pressure at all on the students in regard to the ASSC, and made no attempt to check

on attendance or achievement, not because this was their usual way of operating but because they thought this to be the desire of the public schools; others coerced students into attending, saw that they got to the ASSC school, and carefully checked attendance.

The number of students to be selected from each grade was indicated to the non-public school principals by the principals of the ASSC schools. At times this communication was not clear and more students than allotted were chosen, or seventh and eighth graders would be sent to a K-6 public school and then sent back with the message that they could not be accommodated.

About half of the sending schools prepared grade lists and reading grades for the consideration of the ASSC supervisor in placing the pupils. Those schools which did not do so usually could have but either did not think of it, or did not have the secretarial services necessary to do the job.

After the original groups were settled in the ASSC schools, the sending schools prepared waiting lists of those students needing help, using the same criteria previously indicated. If the ASSC school filled vacancies as they developed from the sending school, these lists were used to determine which students should be sent. (In schools in which the non-public and public school students were integrated in the ASSC classes, these vacancies might be filled by public school students. Some supervisors, following the Board of Education memorandum of May 20, 1966, used vacancies as a means of mingling the public and non-public students).

Registration and Attendance

The enrollment for each remedial group was to be 15 children, with a minimal register of at least ten. Initially, when the register fell below this the supervisor was to contact the non-public school and try to maintain the enrollment by drawing upon a waiting list. When groups consistently fell below ten they were to be combined.

Seventeen non-public ASSC Centers closed because of inadequate registration and attendance prior to the memorandum of May 20. In that memorandum they were ordered reopened no later than Wednesday, May 25th. If enrollment or participation in any of the ASSC schools fell below capacity supervisors were to study the situation to determine the causes, and "conduct a vigorous campaign with the help of staff and parents in order to exert every effort to encourage greater participation on the part of all children, public and non-public school pupils alike, in the after-school study center programs." [1] Reports on enrollment and attendance were to be submitted to the Superintendent of Schools on Friday of each week. This data was analyzed and rearranged as part of the evaluation to prepare the table on page 17.

As can be noted by comparing the registration with the number of sections, the number of students per section was held at about fifteen, the suggested maximum. Attendance averaged 58 per cent of registration, with attendance in reading about ten per cent higher than in mathematics. While registration tended to increase as the program advanced, there was a general decline in the per cent of registered students attending.

Some of the variables which influenced attendance warrant mention here because of the role they played in the functioning of the program. The exact weight that each should be given can only be inferred, but they should be taken into account in interpreting the data.

The manner in which the non-public school principal introduced the ASSC Program to her own staff, children and their parents, contributed in great measure to the children's eventual registration and attendance. If in orientating the parents of the children and the staff, the principal felt the program to be worthwhile and encouraged participation, considerable registration seemed

[1] John B. King, Memorandum on After-School Study Centers for Non-Public School Children, May 20, 1966. Board of Education of the City of New York.

to follow. If the principal was relatively non-commital and passive, so were the parents, staff, and children.

The methods used by the non-public schools to get the children to the ASSC also had a hand in determining the number who attended. For example, some parochial school teachers gathered the children after dismissal from their non-public school and took them as a group to the ASSC. In some cases they even held students and delivered them for their 4:15 p.m. classes. These students had demonstrably better attendance records than students who were left on their own to arrive at the ASSC. Similarly, attendance was higher for students whose home schools had organized parents to collect the students and take them to the public school ASSC.

A number of the ASSC supervisors themselves were active in attempting to keep participation by the non-public schools at a high level. They could often accomplish this by scrupulously reporting individual student's attendance on a daily basis to the home school principal and by discussing any problems that might have led to a student's absence. Use of report cards and attendance certificates by the ASSC supervisor also stimulated greater student involvement.

Disruptive influences on attendance and registration were likewise apparent. Or Wednesdays many of the parochial schools dismissed their students early because of religious instruction. Only the most conscientious of pupils would then appear for the ASSC. Parents played a crucial role in withdrawing already enrolled students from the program. There were a few instances of fights and contention between the public and non-public school pupils, and some parents who heard of these feared that their own children might become implicated, and withdrew them. The dismissal time of after 5:00 p.m. led some parents to feel that they should pick up their children at the public

school, but they found it inconvenient or impossible to do so, and thus withdrew them. Other parents made demands on the children's after school time for such tasks as shopping, cleaning, and baby-sitting that interfered with their presence in the ASSC.

Some of the pupils who dropped out of the remedial and tutorial classes with which this study is concerned did not leave the ASSC altogether. In many schools the students found after enrolling in reading and mathematics that they could attend classes in art, music, or health education instead and changed their programs.

One further factor must be taken into account in interpreting the attendance data. With only a few exceptions, the Jewish non-public schools chose not to participate in the full ASSC Program. The Centers fed by these schools closed for lack of attendance, and then reopened to accommodate any interested pupils, public or non-public. Therefore, attendance figures from these Centers are irregular and fluctuated considerably.

Supervision and Organization

The guide lines for the supervision of the program stated: [1]

> 5.1 Assistant Principals (elementary) are to be assigned as building supervisors. Where an assistant principal is not available, acting assistant principals, junior principals or principals may fill the assignment. The supervisor is expected to be on the roster of the ASSC school. Only in very exceptional cases may the supervisor come from another elementary school; the approval of the district superintendent and this office must be obtained for this.

[1] Bernard Donovan, Memorandum on After-School Study Centers and Enrichment Program for Non-Public School Children, May 9, 1966. Board of Education of the City of New York.

Supervision and Organization (Continued)

5.2 The supervisors are to be assigned for those days scheduled for center operations.

5.3 These supervisors must assume responsibility for
- Adapting the objectives and program to the individual pupil needs
- motivating pupil attendance through appropriate procedures involving pupils, teachers, guidance counselors, parents, etc.
- training teachers
- supervising and coordinating schedules, payrolls, attendance and other records, materials, health and safety measures, etc.
- coordinating the After-School Study Center Programs with the non-public school from which pupils are drawn
- evaluating programs
- recruiting, training and assigning volunteers to work under direction of teachers
- fire drills to be held periodically to acquaint non-public school pupils with our fire drill regulations.

5.4 In those schools where there is an existing ASSC for public school children, the supervisor of that center is also responsible for the supervision of the additional teachers in the non-public school program. If the total number of teachers assigned to serve non-public school pupils is five or more, application may be for authorization to assign an additional supervisor.

In the majority of cases the supervisor of the ASSC was the assistant principal of the school in which the Center was located, though in a number of schools the principal was also the ASSC supervisor. There were about as many variations in programming as are possible given a two-hour period, several math and reading sections, and as many teachers. In most cases, where both math and reading were offered, the students took each for one hour, generally with different teachers. There were also some teachers who taught both reading and math, some students who took either

reading or math for the two hours, and others who took either reading or math for an hour and then "enrichment" for the other hour.

Almost all of the non-public ASSC schedules initially ran from 3:30 to 5:30 p.m. Some changes occurred after the May 20 memorandum and are discussed in the section on Mingling. Each session was split into two periods of approximately one hour each.

Most of the supervisors sampled grouped their classes homogeneously, after informally testing the pupils. In some cases they had records from the sending schools on which to base their decisions. A few of the non-public schools even suggested class groupings, generally based on a combination of grade and reading level. Unequal class registers were invariably the result when supervisors grouped strictly according to grade level, for the non-public schools did not necessarily send pupils based on an equal number from each grade.

Supervisory methods also varied. Most supervision was limited to informally visiting the classes each day. Some supervisors required lesson plans and/or logs and examined them; others suggested lesson plans; a few did not require plans or logs. For the most part it seemed that teachers were left to work out their own classroom problems with little supervision either requested or offered. Since most of the teachers were drawn from the regular faculty of the public school and therefore the supervisor and teachers were familiar with one another, to a certain degree the relaxed standards of supervision are quite understandable.

Coordination

The program was generally begun with a face-to-face meeting between the principals of the non-public school and the ASSC school. While there were some staff members from the non-public schools who visited the Centers, for the most part there was little personal contact between the public school and non-public school groups. Examples were seen at the other extreme, however; at least three ASSC schools arranged full staff meetings between ASSC teachers and those from sending schools.

After the initial meeting most contact between the supervisors and the non-public principals was by telephone. These talks concerned attendance and the rare discipline problems that occurred. Some of the supervisors went further by sending periodic individual attendance and pupil progress reports to the sending schools. One saw to it that the papers of children that showed progress or extra effort got back to their official teachers.

When asked to sum up their feelings concerning the coordination that took place, both the non-public and public school principals felt a need for more time to better organize their efforts, but they also felt that the general rapport that had developed was excellent.

Mingling

It was indicated previously that one of the areas of controversy and misunderstanding concerned whether the ASSC for non-public school children was meant to include public school students, and whether the ASSC for public school students should be integrated with the non-public program. Executive Deputy Superintendent King, in the memorandum of May 20, 1966, had stated that "All after-school study centers must be open to all children, public and non-public school pupils alike. . . . All classes and groups should, therefore, include both public and non-public school pupils."

Whereas the public ASSC's had been scheduled from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m., the non-public ASSC's in the same schools were running usually from 3:30 to 5:30 p.m. Principals were instructed to reschedule their ASSC classes to the period from 3:15 to 5:15 p.m., or earlier, in order to include both non-public and public school children in the same classes.

The large majority of schools in our sample disregarded this portion of the memorandum. The supervisors continued to run separate public and non-public sessions, often on different floors of the building. The reason most commonly stated was that they had received the memorandum too late and it would be too difficult to reschedule the entire program. Moreover, it was felt that it would be educationally unsound to require the students to adjust to a new teacher for the brief time remaining, and difficult for the new teacher to get to know the individual student well enough to be able to be effective in overcoming their educational handicaps.

In many cases these separate programs represented not so much a conscious attempt at keeping the groups apart, but rather a more practical means of organization. If a supervisor found that he already had a full section of non-public school students, he saw no reason to disturb it. The most common method used to follow the intent of the memorandum was to wait until there was a drop in the register of the non-public classes. Instead of following the practice of going to the non-public waiting list, the supervisor would then put a public school student in the empty place.

Staff

Since the non-public ASSC was started after the public program, teachers were selected from those who were in a sense "left over." Supervisors indicated that they selected their staffs from the most competent of the volunteers.

All rated their staffs as at least average, with a number stating that they represented a better than average cross-section of teachers and were as competent as those who had originally applied for the public ASSC. Most of the supervisors were able to comply with the Board of Education's request to select faculty from their own schools, although there were several who could not find sufficient volunteers and had to solicit outside.

The teachers also reflected a wide range in years of service. They varied from the newly appointed to those with more than twenty years experience, with a mean of about two to three years. That the mean is fairly low may be accounted for in part by the fact that many of the older teachers who might otherwise have been interested in this opportunity had already committed themselves to jobs elsewhere at the beginning of the school year.

Class Visits

The generally informal, relaxed atmosphere created by the teachers, and the restrained behavior of the students, were two features that stood out in the class visits. According to the teachers they were more interested than the regular students and easier to teach.

The teachers were rated as good to excellent by the evaluation team. Much use was made by the teachers of individually prepared mimeographed lessons. Some schools were well-stocked with materials, the SRA Reading Labs being most commonly used. Other materials included some new basal readers, the Mac Millan Reading Spectrum, New Continental Practices in English, and Moving Ahead in Arithmetic.

On the other hand, an equal number of schools were at the opposite extreme. Teachers tried to make do with seriously inadequate materials. Promised supplies did not arrive on time. Some teachers resented having to use the public school equipment with non-public school children because they feared it might result in their own students being neglected. In some cases they had the non-public students bring their own texts from their home schools and used them for instruction.

REGISTRATION AND ATTENDANCE IN NON-PUBLIC ASSC PROGRAM

READING					MATH				READING AND MATH COMBINED			
Wk Beginning	No. of Sect.	Registration	Attendance	Percent Attending	No. of Sect.	Registration	Attendance	Percent attending	No. of Sect.	Registration	Attendance	Percent attending
4-25-66	4.1	74	150	65	1.3	10	45	51	5.0	74	160	60
5-2-66	4.3	50	115	77	2.0	31	70	66	5.7	83	170	73
5-9-66	3.8	53	125	78	2.2	32	68	72	5.8	85	177	76
5-16-66	3.7	61	76	42	2.2	33	43	43	5.7	87	107	42
5-23-66	3.8	60	109	61	2.1	32	57	61	5.8	80	150	61
5-30-66	3.9	60	108	61	2.2	33	53	54	6.0	92	141	58
6-6-66	3.8	66	74	41	2.1	36	43	40	5.9	91	118	41
6-13-66	3.7	66	124	63	1.7	32	30	35	5.3	95	101	52
Total	3.9	61	110	61	2.0	30	51	53	5.2	86	141	58

Notes:
Data is for school in study sample
"Number of Sections"= mean number of sections formed. Number of reading and math sections combined is not necessarily the total of separate reading and math because some schools reported only the combined figures.
"Registration"= mean total registration for the three day week
"Attendance"= mean total attendance for the three day week
"Per Cent Attending"= Completed by dividing 1) Registration by No. of Sections to get number of students per sections
2) Total weekly attendance by 3 to get average daily attendance
3) 2 by 1 to find percent attending

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section deals with some of the more subjective data gathered as part of the evaluation of the non-public ASSC program and discussion by the evaluation team. It is divided into three sections: reactions to the program as it existed, problems to consider for the future, and a general summary.

The most positive aspect of this first stage of the non-public ASSC program was the generally congenial relationship that existed between the non-public schools and their local public schools. Communication was established and each party felt that the other was genuinely interested in working together to help solve the student's problems. At the same time both the non-public and the public school staffs were put under increased pressure as a direct result of the haste with which this program got underway, and as a result some bad feelings developed. Consideration of some of these might enable those in charge of future ASSC programs to avoid or deal with them.

For the non-public schools the question of interesting the students and possibly more important, their parents, in participating in this program was a troublesome task. The limited time that the non-public school principals were allotted to inform the parents and select the candidates for the Centers made the job much more difficult. In many cases the principals themselves were not clear as to the content and structure of the program and therefore could neither communicate the information clearly nor adequately answer questions as they arose. Many of the parents who send their children to the non-public schools do so because they have a "Blackboard Jungle" image of the public schools. A great deal of time, thought and effort needs to be given to erase that image so that these parents will be willing

to permit their children to make use of the opportunities offered in the ASSC.

Selection of pupils for the program posed some difficulty because of the serious understaffing in the non-public schools. In most cases there was no secretarial help available to make up rosters, copy grade levels and test results, or indicate suggested grouping or areas needing remedial work. As a result, the already overworked principal felt obliged, though reluctantly, to accept the burden of the necessary clerical work.

For the public school principals and supervisors the setting up of the Centers was equally arduous. The tasks of establishing contact with the non-public schools, collecting a staff, setting a schedule, programming students, etc., in less than three days time meant that ordinary responsibilities had to be set aside and work done for the non-public ASSC during public school hours. Many supervisors both questioned the ethic of having been forced into this position and resented not being able to service their own students adequately during this period.

Staffing of the program at such short notice created several problems. In the attempt to rapidly assemble teachers, some responded to the call without fully considering the implications of the added work. These teachers found that they had to be absent frequently, or dropped out of the program altogether. The resulting disruption in the classroom would be followed by decreased attendance on the part of the students and loss of faith in the program by the non-public school personnel. More than one non-public school principal identified these phenomena as the cause of the decrease in attendance in the ASSC by her children.

The ASSC supervisors also found it difficult to comprehend the

salary schedule and explain it to their staffs. (See appendix) No one seemed to understand how the salaries were arrived at or why they had gained approval. Some of the supervisors' difficulties with the schedule may have arisen because they were paid the same $16.40 per two-hour session as the "specialty teachers" and they felt their efforts and responsibilities were worth more.

A remedial reading or mathematics teacher could be as much a specialist as a music, art, or health education teacher, yet the remedial teachers were paid $12.95 as compared to the "specialists" at $16.40 per two-hour session.

The job of the supervisors was made even more difficult by confusion resulting from hasty implementation. Part of this can be explained as the usual sort of difficulties that arise in getting any new program underway. Part can be explained by changes in the personnel at the Board in charge of the non-public ASSC program during the course of the program. But a major portion of the responsibility must lie with the planners and developers of the entire program who were vague both in working out and communicating such details as starting time, procedures for mingling the non-public and public school children, objectives of the program, etc. As a result, supervisors who called the Board to get answers to problems they were having, received the impression that those on top did not understand what was going on. To add to this dilemma more interest was shown in this program in terms of the press, the various evaluation teams from the Center for Urban Education, and public officials, than had ever been shown in the public ASSC. (Some public ASSC supervisors regarded this rather cynically). On the one hand the supervisors felt confused and unsure of themselves in the administration of the program; on the other hand, they were more in the

limelight than ever before. Furthermore, the kind of administrative assistance that supervisors had come to expect in the public after School Study Centers was not available in the non-public School Centers until several weeks after the start of the program. Supervisors were warned to "expect" delays in attendance forms, salary forms, instructional materials, etc., and unfortunately the warnings came to pass.

In considering the future of the program, interest centered around two main areas: where should it meet and when. Opinion was almost unanimous from both non-public and public school personnel t[illegible] it would be much more practical to hold the Centers in the home schools. [illegible]is would solve some of the more difficult attendance and transportation problems. A number of non-public and public school people also felt that the present structure made too long a day for the students. In addition to favoring the Center's location in the non-public schools, they also suggested that the classes be worked into the regular school day.

If the program is to be continued in the public schools, the whole matter of attendance will need further study. Many students require transportation to and/or from the ASSC in order to participate. Without some arrangement made, pupils will be excluded because of parental fears of their traveling alone at the hour at which the ASSC closes. Several of the non-public principals predict that attendance will drop substantially during the winter months when it gets dark early and weather interferes more with the travel.

The practicality of mingling the non-public and public school programs will also have to be considered further. Because of the time needed to travel from the home to the ASSC school, it is not feasible to start most of the non-public programs before 3:15. However, if the public program is held

up to wait for the non-public school children, both teachers and students will be offended and inconvenienced by the delay. It would appear to be difficult to have the same starting times for both programs in many ASSC schools.

Mingling may bring up other issues. Some of the non-public school principals expressed great concern about their students being in the same classes with public school children. They felt that their children were above the academic level of public school children of the same grade. This is supported by comments from the ASSC teachers who found the non-public school students to be easier to teach and functioning on a higher level than their regular students. In addition there is fear that "trouble" might start between the two groups. Some of the non-public principals said that they could no longer encourage their pupils to attend the ASSC if mingling took place, or that even if they did encourage them the parents would object.

In conclusion, the following suggestions were made for improving the program:

1. Allow much more time prior to the opening of the program for conferences both between the non-public and public schools and within the schools themselves. Both parties need to be encouraged to initiate contact since there is some hesitancy to do so.
2. Organize the co-ordinating office at the Board of Education so it can be more responsive to the needs of the After School Study Centers. Be sure that schools are adequately supplied, that materials arrive in time to be used, and that whatever forms are necessary for the administration of the program are available at the program's inception.

3. Prepare public information personnel and materials for use by the non-public and public schools in interesting parents and students in the program. The ASSC will collapse without parent support, and many parents need to develop a more accurate and less fearful image of the public schools. Inviting the parents to school activities and meetings might help break down some barriers.
4. Extend the program in all schools to include the 7th and 8th grades, or have suitable referral available.
5. Arrange appropriate transportation to and from the Centers wherever necessary. One possibility might be the development of central depots in each area for the dismissal of students. A solution to the transportation problem could be the increased use of decentralized "store-front" schools with several such tutoring offices in each neighborhood closer to the children's homes.
6. Re-examine the salary schedules for reading and mathematics teachers. Their pay should at least be the equivalent of other "specialists" in the ASSC.
7. Reconsider the decision that led to the introduction of this program at such short notice and its concurrent evaluation. There is growing dismay that this precipitous approach is becoming typical of programs dealing with the disadvantaged and the resulting disorder may result in feeding critics of the federal programs. The seven weeks that the program ran might have been more advantageously used in planning a better conceived and better organized program for the following term.

8. Continuation of this program should be accompanied by research of the nature indicated in the original prospectus. If children are to be encouraged to spend additional hours in school, more must be known of the effect upon them.

Dist.	P.S. Location	Non-Public School Name	Class sections in After-School Study Center	Distance in Blocks	Grade Span	Total Register	Projected Register	Staff T	Staff S	Staff Sy
*3	51	Holy Cross	2	5						
		St. Clemens Mary		5	1 - 8	232	30	2	1	1
3	33	St. Michael	6	6	1 - 8	272	30	2		
		St. Columba		3	1 - 8	596	60	4	1	1
*3	11	Guardian Angel	3	4						
		Chelsea Greek-Amer.		5						
		St. Francis Xavier		4	K - 8	463	45	3	1	1
3	111	Sacred Heart	5	1	K - 8	760	75	5	1	1
		St. Joseph (Monroe St.)	3	1						
		St. James		3						
*4	129	Annunciation	4	2	1 - 8	696	60	4	1	1
4	133	All Saints		2						
4	101	Commander Shea	4	3	1 - 8	667	60	4	1	1
4	83	Our Lady Queen of Angels		4						
		St. Ann		2						
4	78	Holy Rosary	5	3	K - 8	553	45	3	1	1
		Our Lady of Mt. Carmel		4	1 - 8	421	30	2		
4	125	Corpus Christi	5	3						
		St. Joseph		3						

PUBLIC SCHOOL LOCATIONS FOR SERVICES TO DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Grand Total: 91 receiving (public) schools
133 sending (non-public) schools

Dist.	P.S. Location	Non-Public School Name	Class sections in After-School Study Center	Distance in Blocks	Grade Span	Total Register	Projected Register	Staff T	Staff S	Staff Sy
Manhattan										
*1	122	St. George	3	6						
*		St. Stanislaus		3						
*		St. Brigid		2	1 - 8	472	45	3	1	1
*1	34	St. [illegible]	2	1	K - 8	346	30	2	1	1
		Mary Help of Christians		4						
*1	63	Most Holy Redeemer	4	1	1 - 8	585	60	4	1	1
*1	20	Our Lady of Sorrows	4	6	1 - 8	643	60	4	1	1
*2	116	St. Stephen	4	7	K - 8	348	30	2	1	1
		Our Lady of the Scapular		6	K - 8	346	30	2		
2	168	St. Lucy	7	1	1 - 8	364	30	2		
		St. Cecilia		2	1 - 8	776	75	5	1	1
*2	198	St. Francis De Sales	5	4	1 - 8	711	75	5	1	1
3	130	St. Patrick	6	5	K - 8	660	60	4		
		St. Alphonsus		7	1 - 8	175	30	2	1	1
		Transfiguration		4						
3	41	St. Bernard		7	K - 8	471	45	3	1	1
		St. Anthony	9	6						
		St. Joseph (Christopher St.)		7						
		Our Lady of Pompeii		9	K - 8	616	60	4		
		St. Luke		7	K - 8	221	30	2		

Code

* - In study sample
Distance in Blocks - Distance between sending and receiving schools
Grade Span - Grades in Non-Public School
Total Register - Total Number of students in Non-Public School
Projected Register - Expected number of students to be enrolled in AFSC Program
AFSC Staff - AFSC Staff in public school AFSC
T - Teachers
S - Supervisors
Sy- Secretaries
Vacant spaces indicate no data available

Dist.	P.S. Location	Non-Public School Name	After Schl. Study Center	Dist. in Span	Grade Span	Total Reg.	Proj. Reg.	Staff T S SY
19	45	Fourteen Holy Martyrs	9	11	K-8	1063	105	7-1-1
	73	Our Lady of Lourdes	5	3	K-8	782	75	5-1-1
Queens								
23	127	St. Gabriel	5	6	1-8	808	75	5-1-1
23	112	St. Patrick		4				
23	76	St. Rita	5	3	1-8	767	75	5-1-1
23		St. Mary	5	30	1-8	763	75	5-1-1
24	14	St. Leo	5	18	1-8	890	75	5-1-1
26	143	Our Lady of Sorrows	4	11	1-8	727	60	4-1-1
27	123	St. Clement Pope		12				
28	50	St. Pius V	4	2	1-8	600	60	4-1-1
29	48	St. Monica	2	10				
29	36	St. Catherine of Sienna		4				
30	42	St. Michael's		20				
30	10	St. Elizabeth		20				
30	25	St. Aloysius		20				
30	402	Lieut. J.P. Kennedy Home						

Dist.	P.S. Location	Non-Public School Name	After Schl. Study Center	Dist. in Span	Grade Span	Total Reg.	Proj. Reg.	Staff T S SY
7	37	St. Pius		2				
		St. Peter						
		St. Luke		9				
*7	29	St. Adalbert		8				
		S.S. Peter & Paul	4	7	1-8	637	60	4-1-1
8	39	St. Athanasius		2				
*8	146	St. Augustine	4	7	1-8	680	75	5-1-1
*9	35	St. Angela Merici	5	1	1-8	762	75	5-1-1
9	42	Our Lady of Victory		4				
*9	88	Yeshiva Zichronmoshe		3	K-8	690	75	5-1-1
*10	32	St. Joseph	5	15	1-8	717	75	5-1-1
*12	20	St. John Chrysostom	6	2	1-8	978	90	6-1-1
*12	150	St. Anthony of Padua	4	3	1-8	575	60	4-1-1
*12	6	St. Thomas Aquinas	5	1	1-8	817	75	5-1-1
Brooklyn								
*13	287	St. James	3	5	1-8	476	45	3-1-1
13	9	St. Joseph						
13	3	St. Peter Claver	6	2	1-8	320	30	2
		Nativity of our Blessed Lord		4	1-8	696	75	5-1-1

Dist.	P.S. Location	Non-Public School Name	After Schl. Study Center	Dist. in Block	Grade Span	Total Reg.	Proj. Reg.	Staff T S SY
15	32	Our Lady of Peace	4	7				
		St. Agnes		3	1-8	744	60	4-1-1
*15	29	St. Charles Borromeo	11		K-8	386	30	2-1-1
		St. Paul		3	1-8	633	60	4
		St. Peter		6	K-8	447	30	2
15	58	St. Mary Star of The Sea	13	6	1-8	831	75	5-1-1
		Sacred Heart of Jesus & Mary		5	1-8	1167	120	8
15	30	Visitation of B.V.M.	4	4	1-8	717	60	4-1-1
*15	261	Angyrios Fantis School	2	5	K-8	271	30	2-1-1
16	304	St. Ambrose	5	2	1-8	772	75	5-1-1
16	28	St. Benedict	2	2	1-8	240	30	2-1-1
16	274	St. Mark's Lutheran		8				
16	262	Holy Rosary	15	3	K-8	826	75	5-1-1
16	309	Our Lady of Good Counsel		1	1-8	724	60	4-1-1
17	138	Epiphany Lutheran	7	3	K-8	185	30	2-1-1
		St. Gregory		4	1-8	679	45	3
		St. Theresa of Avila						
17	91	St. Francis of Assis	5	3	1-8	897	75	5-1-1
17	316	St. Theresa of Avila		1				
17	167	St. Matthew	9	2	1-8	766	75	5-1-1

Dist.	P.S. Location	Non-Public School Name	After Schl. Study Center	Dist. in Block	Grade Span	Total Reg.	Proj. Reg.	Staff T S SY
13	44	Our Lady of Victory	4	7	1-8	727	60	4-1-1
*13	157	St. Patrick	4	2	1-8	661	60	4-1-1
*13	20	Queen of All Saints	3	3	1-8	561	45	3-1-1
*13	46	Sacred Heart	3	1	1-8	501	45	3-1-1
13	282	St. Augustine						
*13	8	St. Charles Borromeo	2	8				
14	168	All Saints	2	2	1-8	407	30	2-1-1
	274	St. Marks Lutheran		8				
14	17	Annunciation	2	3	1-8	379	30	2-1-1
14	18	Immaculate Conception	2	2	1-8	408	30	2
14	16	Epiphany	4	6	1-8	378	30	2-1-1
14	59	St. John the Baptist	5	7	K-8	836	75	5-1-1
14	250	Most Holy Trinity	6	2	K-8	730	60	4-1-1
14	132	St. Cecelia	8	7	1-8	1279	120	8-1-1
		St. Nicholas	3	6	1-8	463	45	3-1-1
		St. John the Evangelist		5				
14	37	S.S. Peter & Paul	4	3	1-8	600	60	4-1-1
14	122	Transfiguration	10	5	1-8	873	75	5-1-1
16	75	Calvary		2				
		St. Cyprian		2				

Dist.	P.S. Location	Non-Public School Name	Class sections in After-School Study Center	Distance in Blocks	Grade Span	Total Register	Projected Register	Staff T	Staff S	Staff Sy
4	79	St. Paul	4	4	1 - 8	630	60	4	1	1
4	154	St. Aloysius		7						
*5	191	St. Paul The Apostle	4	2	K - 8	687	60	4	1	1
*5	165	Ascension	4	1	1 - 8	685	60	4	1	1
*5	75	Holy Name	7	3	1 - 8	1,096	105	7	1	1
*5	113	St. Thomas the Apostle	3	5	1 - 8	545	45	3	1	1
5	9	Holy Trinity	2	3	1 - 8	282	30	2	1	1
		St. Gregory		7						
5	199	Blessed Sacrament		2						
6	194	Our Lady of Lourdes	4	2	1 - 8	706	60	4	1	1
6	175	St. Marks		7						
6	28	St. Catherine of Genoa	2	3	1 - 8	347	30	2	1	1
6	90	Resurrection		6						
*6	123	St. Charles Borromeo	3	3	1 - 8	499	45	3	1	1
BRONX										
*7	124	Greek-American Inst.	2							
		St. Anselm	7							
7	49	St. Jerome	5							
7	18	St. Rita								
*7	1	Immaculate Conception	8							
		Our Lady of Pity								

THE AFTER-SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN SELECTED PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

Research Staff:

Bruce H. Bernstein, Guidance Director of Brooklyn Academy.
Director of Student Personnel, Project Apex, N.Y.U.
Doctoral Candidate, School of Education, N.Y.U.

Dr. Bernard Abramson, Professor, Mills College of Education.
Assistant Principal, Elementary and Junior
High School, Board of Education, N.Y. C. (retired)

George H. Weinberg, Administrative Assistant in Charge of Guidance,
Morris High School (retired)
Instructor, Counsel Training, City University,
College of the City of New York.
Lecturer - Education Department, Long Island U.

Article in New York Times, June 3, 1966

CITY CLEARS SNAG IN AID TO PUPILS

After-School Centers Must Admit All Disadvantaged Pupils

The Board of Education has directed that the city's after-school centers for disadvantaged children "must be open to all pupils." It acted after receiving complaints that many of the Federally financed centers were admitting only parochial-school pupils.

The centers, which are operated in public-school buildings, provide tutorial and remedial programs in reading and arithmetic. Some also offer enrichment programs in art, music, health education and other fields. All are supported by funds obtained under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which was passed last year by Congress.

One Board of Education member, Dr. Aaron Brown, reported that at a Brooklyn public school he had visited, parochial-school pupils were admitted to the center while the school's own pupils - who, he said, were in greater need of help - were barred.

Closings Reported

Among other complaints made, which school authorities have tacitly admitted, were the following:

> Some centers closed because few parochial-school pupils enrolled, even though many public-school pupils would have attended if given the choice.
>
> Other centers admitted pupils without distinction but provided separate programs on different floors for public and non-public-school pupils, apparently to prevent the mingling of children.

City school authorities said yesterday that the situation had developed unintentionally because of a misinterpretation of directives by some officials. They added that the recent order "should straighten out matters."

Directive Misinterpreted

Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, public-school systems receiving Federal aid must provide equivalent services to disadvantaged pupils attending non-public schools. The city system opened 53 after-school centers for its own pupils with Federal funds last October. In March, Dr. Bernard E. Donovan, the Superintendent of Schools, proposed to the Board of Education that other such centers be operated by the city system in parochial schools for disadvantaged children there.

But the board, the following month, decided that the parochial-school pupils should be accommodated at centers operated in public-school buildings. Twenty-four additional centers were then authorized.

A directive sent to local public-school officials gave details of the additional centers, referring only to serving non-public-school pupils. Many administrators thus assumed that they were to exclude public-schoolpupils from these centers, many of which were opened in neighborhoods that were not being served by previously established centers.

This assumption, board authorities said yesterday, was wrong.

"It was never our intention to exclude any educationally deprived youngster from any after-school study center," one official commented.

The complaints were brought to the school board's attention by the United Parents Associations and the Citizens Committee for Children. Both organizations had sent representatives to the centers to confirm the charges made by parents of public-school pupils.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.